



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,095	01/22/2002	Chih-Shen Chen	CHEN3329	3467

23364 7590 11/13/2003

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 SLATERS LANE  
FOURTH FLOOR  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

BUTLER, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3653

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
10/051,095

Applicant(s)  
Chen

Examiner  
Michael E. Butler

Art Unit  
3653



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 25, 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 4-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3653

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. Applicant's drawings are acceptable.

### *Election/Restriction*

2. Applicant's election of invention I without traverse of the restriction requirement in Paper No. 2 is acknowledged and made final.

3. Claims 4-9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to nonelected invention(s), there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. and Vogt '751 wherein Kennedy et al. discloses:

(re: cl 1) a plastic bag dispenser comprising:  
an assembly with opening on top (11)  
first inward folded bag stack section (25 fig 7; about 28 fig 8)  
second inward bag stack (bottom fig 8 about 30).

Vogt '751 discloses any elements not explicitly disclosed by Kennedy et al.

including:

Art Unit: 3653

adhesive applied on wrinkled area near top of bag. (c9 L 63-c10 L 9).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for Kennedy et al. to use an adhesive joining the bags because the adhesives restrains the second bag reducing the incidence of multiple dispenses as taught by Vogt '751. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for Kennedy et al. to use a wrinkle portion strengthening the adhesion to adjacent bags for reducing the incidence of multiple dispenses as taught by Vogt '751.

6. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. and Smithson et al. wherein Kennedy et al. discloses the elements previously discussed.

Smithson et al. discloses any elements not explicitly disclosed by Kennedy et al. including:

adhesive applied near top of bag. (c7 L 119-52);

(Re: cl 2) opening assembly comprises widthwise opening near one side (25/32).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for Kennedy to using a widthwise slot to ease bag removal reduce the risk of tearing bag as taught by Smithson et al.. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for Kennedy et al. to use an adhesive joining the bags because the adhesives restrains the second bag reducing the incidence of multiple dispenses as taught by Smithson et al..

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3653

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exmr. Michael E. Butler whose telephone number is (703) 308-8344.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Walsh, can be reached on (703) 306-4173. The fax number for the Group is (703) 305-7687.

*Michael E. Butler*

Michael E. Butler

Examiner

*Donald P. Walsh*  
DONALD P. WALSH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600